



Debevoise & Plimpton LLP
66 Hudson Boulevard
New York, NY 10001
+1 212 909 6000

March 3, 2023

BY ECF AND EMAIL

The Honorable Katherine Polk Failla
United States District Court for the Southern District of New York
Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse
40 Foley Square
New York, New York 10007

Re: In re Tether and Bitfinex Crypto Asset Litigation, No. 19 Civ. 9236 (S.D.N.Y.)

Dear Judge Failla:

We write on behalf of Defendants iFinex Inc., BFXNA Inc., BFXWW Inc., Tether Holdings Limited, Tether Limited, DigFinex Inc., Tether Operations Limited, Tether International Limited, Ludovicus Jan van der Velde and Giancarlo Devasini (the “B/T Defendants”) in response to Plaintiffs’ February 28 letter motion. (Dkt. No. 307.)

To the extent the B/T Defendants’ position on Plaintiffs’ proposed Interrogatory No. 13 is not clear from Plaintiffs’ letter and the attached exhibits, the B/T Defendants do not oppose Plaintiffs’ motion to serve an interrogatory that seeks identification of accounts that held USDT reserves during the period from February 17, 2015 through June 5, 2020. The B/T Defendants agreed to identify those accounts by providing the Bates ranges of documents produced to Plaintiffs, such as bank statements.

Beyond the identification of those accounts, Plaintiffs’ proposed Interrogatory No. 13 also seeks, for each account, “the time period during which the account held the Reserves, the name and location of the bank or financial institution with which such account is or was held, and the name, address, and contact information of the account holder.” (Dkt. No. 307, at 1.) The B/T Defendants expect that much of that information will be included in the bank statements and any other documents they identify. However, to the extent that some information is not included in those documents, the B/T Defendants reserve their rights, including their right to object on the basis that searching for additional information would be unduly burdensome.

Accordingly, the B/T Defendants do not oppose Plaintiffs’ motion and agree to meet and confer with Plaintiffs regarding their response to Interrogatory No. 13, as necessary, at the appropriate time.

The B/T Defendants dispute any suggestion that they have failed to comply with their discovery obligations or that their document productions have been deficient. (Dkt. Nos. 307, 307-9.)

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Elliot Greenfield